V. Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and CEQA Environmental Checklist

Mitigated Negative Declaration
DATE: 03/1/2007

Pursuant to the California State Public Resources Code and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, as amended to date, the lead agency California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) submits a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Mammoth Bar OHV Area Motocross Track Repair Project (Project).

PROJECT OVERVIEW

On and prior to January 1, 2006, a series of storms hitting the upper watershed of the Middle Fork of the American River resulted in heavy runoff into the river. This water caused inundation of the sand and gravel bar at Mammoth Bar. The motocross (MX) track, which is located on the gravel bar, was covered by the high flow. When the water receded just a couple of days later it was apparent portions of the track had been damaged by the high water flow. The proposed project is to implement a remediation plan for the motocross track which would involve minor grading to restore the track to near pre-storm function. The repaired track would be contained within the same footprint and for the most part existing turns, curves and jumps would be used.

FINDINGS

The Division, having reviewed the Initial Study for the proposed project, consisting of the attached Initial Study, finds that the following Environmental Factors could be adversely affected by this proposed project. Mitigation measures follow after this listing that will avoid or reduce all potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.

1. Air Quality

The air quality impacts of the repair project are considered less than significant due to the remoteness of the site (i.e., no receptors for dust impacts), small scale of the operation, and short duration (7 -10 days) of the project. The estimated 35 lbs/day project emissions are below the customary 80 lb/day threshold of significance for PM10. Air quality is degraded at the site during open riding days due to vehicle exhaust and dust generation, however, the dust control systems and CARB prohibitions against use of non-complying vehicles on high Ozone days make the ongoing air quality impacts less than significant.

Measure AIR-1. Construction. The principal mitigation for PM10 emissions is to limit site activity to no more than 3.5 acres in any one day and to apply sufficient water to hold down dust. The following list of measures and percent effectiveness applies to this project. Other measures such as installed sprinkler systems and road paving are not warranted for this short term activity.

Source	Mitigation Measure	Effectiveness
Soil Piles	Enclose, cover or water twice daily all soil piles	16%
Exposed Surface/Grading	Water exposed soil with adequate frequency for continued moist soil	75%
Truck Hauling	Water all haul roads twice daily	3%
Truck Hauling On-site	Maintain at least two feet of freeboard	1%
Truck Hauling Off-site	Load Cover load of all haul/dump trucks securely	2%

Source: TRA adapted from SCAQMD, Weighted for percentage contribution of PM10 emissions

2. Biological Resources

CDPR has obtained a streambed alteration agreement with CDFG for the track repair work (CDFG, 2006). The conditions of the agreement that pertain to minimizing impacts biological resources, including the riverine and riparian habitats, are included as mitigation measures below.

Measure BIO-1: The time period for completing the work within the stream zone of the Middle Fork American River shall be restricted to periods of low stream flow and dry weather. Construction activities shall be timed with awareness of precipitation forecasts and likely increases in stream flow. Construction activities shall cease until all reasonable erosion control measures have been implemented prior to all storm events. No work will occur during wet weather. Wet weather is defined as when there has been ¼ inch of rain in a 24-hour period. In addition, no work will occur during a dry out period of 24 hours after the above referenced wet weather. Revegetation, restoration and erosion control work is not confined to this time period.

Measure BIO-2: Precautions to minimize turbidity and siltation of the Middle Fork American River shall be taken into account during project planning and implementation. This may require the placement of silt fencing, coir logs, straw bale dikes, or other siltation barriers so that silt and/or other deleterious materials are not allowed to pass to downstream reaches. Passage of sediment beyond the sediment barriers is prohibited. If any sediment barrier fails to retain sediment, corrective measures shall be taken. The sediment barriers shall be maintained in good operating condition throughout the construction period and the following rainy season. Maintenance includes, but is not limited to, removal of accumulated silt and/or replacement of damaged silt fencing, coir logs, coir rolls, and/or straw bale dikes. CDPR is responsible for the removal of non-biodegradable silt barriers (such as plastic silt fencing) after the disturbed areas have been stabilized with erosion control vegetation after the first growing season. Upon CDFG determination that turbidity/siltation levels resulting from project related activities constitute a threat to aquatic life, activities associated with the turbidity/siltation, shall be halted until effective CDFG approved devices are installed, or abatement procedures are initiated.

Measure BIO-3: Disturbance or removal of vegetation shall not exceed the minimum necessary to complete operations. No native trees with a truck diameter at breast height (DBH) in excess of four (4) inches shall be removed or damaged without prior consultation and approval of a CDFG representative. Using hand tools (clippers, chain saw, etc.) trees may be trimmed to the extent necessary to gain access to the work sites. All cleared material/vegetation shall be removed out of the riparian/stream zone.

Measure BIO-4: Raw cement/concrete or washings thereof, asphalt, paint or other coating material, oil or other petroleum products, or any other substances which could be

hazardous to aquatic life, resulting from project related activities, shall be prevented from contaminating the soil and/or entering the waters of the state. Any of these materials, placed within or where they may enter a stream or lake, by CDPR or any party working under contract, or with permission of the CDPR, shall be removed immediately. CDFG shall be notified immediately by the CDPR of any spills and shall be consulted regarding clean-up procedures.

Measure BIO-5: During construction, the contractor shall not dump any litter or construction debris within the stream zone. All construction debris and associated materials shall be removed from the work area upon completion of the project.

Measure BIO-6: All exposed/disturbed areas and access points within the stream zone left barren of vegetation as a result of the construction activities shall be restored using native grass seeds, native grass plugs and/or a mix of quick growing sterile non-native grass with native grass seeds.

Measure BIO-7: No trees that contain active nests of birds that are protected under the Migratory Bird Act shall be disturbed until all eggs have hatched and young birds have fledged without prior consultation and approval of a CDFG representative.

3. Geology and Soils

The MX Track contains altered soils and fill that has been placed over riverwash (Space Imaging Solutions, 2005). This material was brought in to create the track in the late 1990s (Space Imaging Solutions, 2002a). During the storms of December 2005, some of the altered soils and fill was washed away by flood waters. Only the most compact of the fill remained after the flood waters receded. The repaired track would use only existing material to make the track safe for OHV again. Soils erosion could occur during the repair work. The impacts, however, can be mitigated through the use of specific measures already identified to reduce impacts on riparian habitat and on erodable soils (refer to Bio-1 to BIO-3, and BIO-6 above). These measures restrict the timing of construction work during dry periods, require the use of sediment barriers, and restrict vegetation removal to only that needed to carryout the repairs. No additional mitigation would be necessary.

4. Hydrology and Water Quality

The project has the potential to degrade water quality due to the close proximity of the project site to the Middle Fork American River, and the grading needed to repair the track would create loose soil conditions. The impacts, however, can be mitigated through the use of specific measures already identified to reduce impacts on riparian habitat and on erodable soils (refer to Bio 1-6 above). These measures restrict the timing of construction work during dry periods, require the use of sediment barriers, and restrict vegetation removal to only that needed to carryout the repairs. In addition, CDPR has prepared a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for the project which will support a NPDES permit. No additional mitigation would be necessary.

5. Hazardous Materials

Due to the absence of hazardous materials in the project area, no release of hazardous materials is expected to occur during the repair of the MX Track. There is potential for the heavy equipment used to carry out the track repair work to spill petroleum products during refueling. In order to prevent contamination of on site soils the following mitigation measure would be implemented:

Measure HAZ-1: Refueling for vehicles used during the construction repair project shall including the following:

- Onsite vehicle and equipment fueling will only be used where it is impractical to end

vehicles and equipment offsite for fueling.

- A dedicated fueling area will be established in the Mammoth Bar OHV Area parking lot, protected from storm water run-on and runoff, and located at least 50 ft away from downstream drainage facilities and watercourses. Fueling will be performed on a level-grade area.
- Drip pans or absorbent pads will be used during vehicle and equipment fueling.
- Fueling operations will not be left unattended.

BASIS OF FINDINGS

The CDPR, having reviewed the Initial Study for the proposed project finds that: Based on the environmental evaluation presented herein, the Project will not cause significant adverse effects related to aesthetics, air quality, agricultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, mineral resources, noise, population/housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic and utilities/service systems. In addition, substantial adverse effects on humans, either direct or indirect, will not occur. The Project does not affect any important examples of the major periods of California prehistory or history, nor will the project cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

The carefully designed remediation plan which relies on use of on-site material, the short term duration of the work, and the use of mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study, will ensure that all impacts remain less than significant.

Attached is the Initial Study prepared for the Project. The public can view the documents used in preparation of the Initial Study at the California Department of Parks and Recreation, OHMVR Division at: 1725 23rd St., Ste. 200 Sacramento, CA 95816-7100.

1. PROJECT TITLE: Mammoth Bar Motocross (MX) Track Repair

2. LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS:

State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation

3. CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER:

Mike Lynch, (530) 823-4140
Email: mlync@parks.ca.gov

4. PROJECT LOCATION: Mammoth Bar OHV Area within the Auburn State Recreation Area (ASRA), Placer County, California

5. PROJECT SPONSOR'S NAME AND ADDRESS:

State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation
Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation (OHMVR) Division
1725 23rd Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95816

6. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: The project is located within lands of the ASRA.

7. ZONING: Water Influence Zone

8. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: See Sections 1 and 2 of the Initial Study

9. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING: The Mammoth Bar OHV Area is part of the Auburn State Recreation Area (ASRA). It is located in the Sierra Nevada foothills about thirty miles northeast of Sacramento. The terrain is mostly relatively steep south-facing slopes densely vegetated with chaparral and mixed oak woodlands. The landscape history of the area has been influenced by the gold mining activities that began in the mid 1800's and continued until the early 1900's. The Middle Fork of the American River forms the southern border and low point of the project site.

10. OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED: The OHV Area is located on public land owned by the federal government and is under the jurisdiction of the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation). It is within the designated water inundation area of the proposed Auburn Dam. The project will require NEPA compliance and the approval of Reclamation.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a Potentially Significant Impact as indicated by the checklist on the following pages. All impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation incorporated into the project.

■ **Aesthetics**	☐ **Agricultural Resources**	■ **Air Quality**
■ **Biological Resources**	■ **Cultural Resources**	■ **Geology /Soils**
■ **Hazards & Hazardous Materials**	■ **Hydrology / Water Quality**	■ **Land Use / Planning**
☐ **Mineral Resources**	■ **Noise**	☐ **Population / Housing**
☐ **Public Services**	■ **Recreation**	☐ **Transportation / Traffic**
☐ **Utilities / Service Systems**	■ **Mandatory Findings of Significance**	

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

■ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a ”potentially significant impact” or ”potentially significant unless mitigated“ impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature	Date
Signature	Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is

appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact". The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, Earlier Analyses, may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

    a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

    b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

    c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated", describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

    a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

    b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	■

I. AESTHETICS

Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No Impact. The proposed project would take place within an area that has been subject to ongoing OHV activities since the late 1970s. The MX Track, which is the subject of the repair project, has been in existence since 1997. Following repair of the track, there would be no noticeable difference in the visual environment within the OHV Area from the pre-storm conditions. The track is not visible from the river upstream where rafters take out due to the presence of a large gravel bar and the fact that the river curves around Mammoth Bar. The take-out is located at the upstream end of the gravel bar while the track is located at the bottom and inside curve of the river (refer to Figure 1-2).

b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. The track repair project would not damage scenic resources, mature trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings. There are no officially designated state scenic highways near or within view of the Mammoth Bar MX track repair project area.

c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

No Impact. Repair of the MX Track that has been in existence since 1997 would not change the visual character of the area. All of the repair activities would take place within the existing footprint of the MX Track. There are no visually unique or distinctive features of the project site that would be affected by the project.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

No Impact. No new lights are proposed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES -- In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	■

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

No Impact. Responses a-c. The project would not create adverse impacts to agricultural resources as no agricultural activities take place within the project area. The site is contained within a designated recreation area.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	■	☐	☐
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	■	☐	☐
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	■	☐	☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	■	☐	☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	■	☐

III. AIR QUALITY

Would the project:

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation. Responses a-d. The proposed action involves only minor grading by heavy equipment to repair the track so that the public can safely use it. The site is on the lower terrace gravel along the river and does not contain any naturally occurring asbestos, ultramafic rock, or serpentine. The total affected area is roughly 3.5 acres. The track repair would take about 7-10 days to complete and would employ a crew of 2-4 persons using a front loader, a small bulldozer, and water truck for dust control. The work

largely rebuilds the existing track and will not entail major earthmoving. The realigned 800-foot section of service road would be rebuilt by grading existing materials with no imported earth.

Localized, short term air quality degradation could result from diesel exhaust from the heavy equipment used during minor grading (front loader, small dozer, water truck) and from dust being generated while grading is taking place. The operation of the equipment would occur on weekdays when the area has the fewest visitors. A screening level emissions factor commonly applied in environmental documents for daily particulate emissions for a construction site with minimal earthmoving and routine watering for dust control is 10.1 pounds PM10 per acre per day (derived from CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, June 2004, Table 5-2 Construction Activity with Potentially Significant Impacts). When this factor is applied to the 3.5 acre work site for the proposed action, peak construction PM10 emissions would be approximately 35 pounds per acre per day.

Most local air quality management or air pollution control districts in California have established a significance threshold for use in state environmental compliance review (CEQA). Typical thresholds are: 80 lbs/day (Feather River AQMD http://www.fraqmd.org/CEQA_Thresholds.htm); Bay Area AQMD (CEQA GUIDELINES Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, December, 1999; Monterey Bay UAPCD, CEQA GUIDELINES, June 2004). The corresponding agencies at Placer County, Eldorado County, and Sacramento Metropolitan AQMD do not set an emissions threshold for PM10.

The air quality impacts of the repair project are considered less than significant due to the remoteness of the site (i.e., no receptors for dust impacts), small scale of the operation, and short duration (7 -10 days) of the project. The estimated 35 lbs/day project emissions are below the customary 80 lb/day threshold of significance for PM10. Air quality is degraded at the site during open riding days due to vehicle exhaust and dust generation, however, the dust control systems and CARB prohibitions against use of non-complying vehicles on high Ozone days make the ongoing air quality impacts less than significant.

Measure Measures:

Measure AIR-1. Construction. The principal mitigation for PM10 emissions is to limit site activity to no more than 3.5 acres in any one day and to apply sufficient water to hold down dust. The following list of measures and percent effectiveness applies to this project. Other measures such as installed sprinkler systems and road paving are not warranted for this short term activity.

Source	Mitigation Measure	Effectiveness
Soil Piles	Enclose, cover or water twice daily all soil piles	16%
Exposed Surface/Grading	Water exposed soil with adequate frequency for continued moist soil	75%
Truck Hauling	Water all haul roads twice daily	3%
Truck Hauling On-site	Maintain at least two feet of freeboard	1%
Truck Hauling Off-site	Load Cover load of all haul/dump trucks securely	2%

Source: TRA adapted from SCAQMD, Weighted for percentage contribution of PM10 emissions

Effectiveness: The measures listed above would reduce potentially significant air quality impacts to less than significant levels.
Implementation: A CDPR Gold Fields District staff member would monitor the site.
Timing: Throughout the construction and use phase, when applicable.

Monitoring: CDPR, Gold Fields District.

Measure AIR-2. Operation: All dust control measures and CARB restrictions now applied at Mammoth Bar will continue to apply to recreational use of the repaired track. No additional measures are needed.

e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Less than Significant Impact. The activities associated with the construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in the creation of objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The heavy equipment used to repair the track would emit diesel fumes; however, the area where the equipment would be operated would be closed to public access and the work would last only 7-10 days.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	■	☐	☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	■	☐
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	■	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	■
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	■

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less than Significant Impact. A series of wildlife surveys have been conducted at the Mammoth Bar OHV area since 2000 (Jones and Stokes, 2000; Williams, 2002; and CDPR, 2002, 2002a, 2002b, 2003, and 2003a). In addition, a Wildlife Habitat Protection Plan (WHPP) was developed for the area in 2002 by Brian Williams in support of an application for state OHV grant monies. Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix D provides a list of the special status species addressed by the surveys and the WHPP and includes a summary of the likelihood of presence in the project area.

Special Status Animals. Federally Listed. The Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (VELB) is the only federally listed species known, assumed, or suspected to occur in the Mammoth Bar OHVA, and specifically within proximity to the MX Track repair site. Possible presence of the species is based on the presence of five elderberry shrubs in the park (Jones & Stokes Associates 2000); the elderberry is the host plant of the VELB. Although a few scattered elderberry shrubs occur in the park, no VELB or VELB sign (exit holes) have been observed on these shrubs (CDPR 2002; CDPR, 2003). The nearest elderberry shrubs are 378 feet northeast of the MX track and would not be impacted by the track repair work (refer to Figure III-1).

State Listed. No state-listed wildlife species are known or suspected to occur at Mammoth Bar OHVA, and specifically within proximity of the MX Track repair site. A few species (e.g., bald eagle, peregrine falcon) may breed in the American River canyons, but there is no suitable nesting habitat thought to exist on the OHVA. The ringtail is a state fully protected species that could occur in the OHVA; however, this species is nocturnal and daytime OHV activities are not likely to impact this species.

Special Concern Species. According to Williams (2002), “there is no obvious impact of OHV use on any special-status species restricted to riverside or riparian habitats on the Mammoth Bar OHVA. This is probably because OHV use and associated users do not heavily impact the shoreline of Mammoth Bar (which appears to be visited at least as frequently by general recreationalists and river rafters).”

The only special status species known to occur in close proximity of the MX track are the yellow warbler and the yellow-breasted chat. Both of these species were found by Williams (2002) in riparian habitat immediately adjacent to the track. Williams guesses that “it is possible that the predictability made possible by the defined OHV track as well as day- and time-use restrictions have reduced the impact of OHV us on these species.”

Special-Status Plants. Plant surveys of the Mammoth Bar OHV area were conducted in 2002 on April 16, 19, and 26; May 3, and 7; July 3, and 12; August 13 and September 6 by Environmental Science Associates. Although abundant potential habitat for many of the special status plants occurs in the area, no special-status plant species were located during the surveys.

A list of the special-status plant species with the potential to occur and descriptions of their habitat associations and bloom periods is provided in Table 2 of Appendix D. This table was prepared by Environmental Sciences Associates (2002) (Space Imaging Solutions,

December 2002).

b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Three sensitive plant communities were identified in the OHV Area. They include narrow-leaf willow series and mixed willow series, which are riparian vegetation types, and sedge series, which is a wetland vegetation type. The riparian vegetation types are associated with the Middle Fork of the American River and Murderer's Gulch and the several unnamed drainages. The wetland vegetation areas occur in areas having relatively flat slopes, within valleys, and are associated with some drainages (Space Imaging Solutions, 2002a).

Since the MX Track repair work would be done within the existing footprint of the MX Track, there would be no new impacts on the riparian habitat that occurs along the flood plain of the Middle Fork of the American River. In addition, the portion of the repaired track that is closest to the river would be realigned so that it is further from the river (80 to 100 feet instead of 50 feet).

CDPR has obtained a streambed alteration agreement with CDFG for the track repair work (CDFG, 2006). The conditions of the agreement that pertain to minimizing impacts biological resources, including the riverine and riparian habitats, are included as mitigation measures below. The agreement is contained in Appendix C.

Mitigation Measure:

Measure BIO-1: The time period for completing the work within the stream zone of the Middle Fork American River shall be restricted to periods of low stream flow and dry weather. Construction activities shall be timed with awareness of precipitation forecasts and likely increases in stream flow. Construction activities shall cease until all reasonable erosion control measures have been implemented prior to all storm events. No work will occur during wet weather. Wet weather is defined as when there has been ¼ inch of rain in a 24-hour period. In addition, no work will occur during a dry out period of 24 hours after the above referenced wet weather. Revegetation, restoration and erosion control work is not confined to this time period.

Measure BIO-2: Precautions to minimize turbidity and siltation of the Middle Fork American River shall be taken into account during project planning and implementation. This may require the placement of silt fencing, coir logs, straw bale dikes, or other siltation barriers so that silt and/or other deleterious materials are not allowed to pass to downstream reaches. Passage of sediment beyond the sediment barriers is prohibited. If any sediment barrier fails to retain sediment, corrective measures shall be taken. The sediment barriers shall be maintained in good operating condition throughout the construction period and the following rainy season. Maintenance includes, but is not limited to, removal of accumulated silt and/or replacement of damaged silt fencing, coir logs, coir rolls, and/or straw bale dikes. CDPR is responsible for the removal of non-biodegradable silt barriers (such as plastic silt fencing) after the disturbed areas have been stabilized with erosion control vegetation (after the first growing season). Upon CDFG determination that turbidity/siltation levels resulting from project related activities constitute a threat to aquatic life, activities associated with the turbidity/siltation, shall be halted until effective CDFG approved devices are installed, or abatement procedures are initiated.

Measure BIO-3: Disturbance or removal of vegetation shall not exceed the minimum necessary to complete operations. No native trees with a truck diameter at breast height (DBH) in excess of four (4) inches shall be removed or damaged without prior consultation and approval of a CDFG representative. Using hand tools (clippers, chain saw, etc.) trees may be trimmed to the extent necessary to gain access to the work sites. All cleared material/vegetation shall be removed out of the riparian/stream zone.

Measure BIO-4: Raw cement/concrete or washings thereof, asphalt, paint or other coating material, oil or other petroleum products, or any other substances which could be hazardous to aquatic life, resulting from project related activities, shall be prevented from contaminating the soil and/or entering the waters of the state. Any of these materials, placed within or where they may enter a stream or lake, by CDPR or any party working under contract, or with permission of the CDPR, shall be removed immediately. CDFG shall be notified immediately by the CDPR of any spills and shall be consulted regarding clean-up procedures.

Measure BIO-5: During construction, the contractor shall not dump any litter or construction debris within the stream zone. All construction debris and associated materials shall be removed from the work area upon completion of the project.

Measure BIO-6: All exposed/disturbed areas and access points within the stream zone left barren of vegetation as a result of the construction activities shall be restored using native grass seeds, native grass plugs and/or a mix of quick growing sterile non-native grass with native grass seeds. The provision does not apply to the track portions of the project.

Measure BIO-7: A qualified biologist shall conduct a survey for nesting raptors and other birds within five days prior to the start of construction activities. If active nests are not present, construction activities can take place as scheduled. If more than 5 days elapse between the initial nest search and the beginning of construction activities, another nest survey shall be conducted. If any active nests are detected, a qualified biologist shall determine the appropriate buffer to be established around the nest. CDFG generally accepts a 50-foot radius buffer around passerine and non-passerine land bird nests, and up to a 250-foot radius for raptors, however the biologist shall have flexibility to reduce or expand the buffer depending on the specific circumstances. No trees that contain active nests of birds that are protected under the Migratory Bird Act shall be disturbed until all eggs have hatched and young birds have fledged without prior consultation and approval of a CDFG representative.

Effectiveness: Will reduce potentially significant impact to less than significant levels.
Implementation: A CDPR, Gold Fields District Resource Ecologist would monitor the site.
Timing: Throughout the construction and use phase, when applicable.
Monitoring: CDPR, Gold Fields District.

c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Less than Significant Impact. The MX Track is located within the flood plain of the Middle Fork of the American River, however, the track is not located within an area that contains wetlands and is located above the ordinary high water mark of the river. Therefore, the project is not under USACE jurisdiction.

d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Less than Significant Impact. Since the MX track has been in existence and in operation since the late 1990's, any resident or migratory wildlife using the area near the track would likely have adapted to track use during the authorized operating days and hours (three days a week in the spring and summer and four days during the fall and winter). The ongoing presence of OHV use of the area likely precludes wildlife from establishing nursery sites within the area of intensive OHV use.

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No Impact. Since the project is located on federal land and is being administered by a state agency, there are no local ordinances that apply.

f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact. There are no HCPs or NCCPs in effect for the project area.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in . 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to . 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	■

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in . 15064.5;

No Impact. The project would not adversely affect districts or sites listed in, or eligible for listing in, the National Register of Historic Places, nor would it result in loss or destruction of historical resources (CDPR, 2002c). The closest historic resource to the project area is a rock retaining wall located across and uphill of the Park's main access road (Figure 7 in Space Imaging Solutions, 2002a).

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to . 15064.5;

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

No Impact. Responses b – d. CDPR completed a Project Evaluation Form (PEF) for the grooming and maintenance of the MX Track, the 90 cc track and the ATV training area in 2002. According to that PEF no activities associated with the OHV grooming and maintenance work at Mammoth Bar would affect cultural resources (CDPR, Hines, 2002). It further stated that all of the track and training areas have been previously surveyed for cultural resources by Archaeologists at CDPR (CDPR, Hines, 2002). Since the MX Track repair project is totally contained within the area affected by the grooming and maintenance work previously assessed, no impacts to cultural resources are expected.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	■
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	■
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	■
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	■	☐	☐
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	■
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	■

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

iii) Seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction?

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. Space Imaging Solutions prepared a report on the geologic and hydrologic conditions at the Mammoth Bar OHV Areas (Space Imaging Solutions, 2005). The following excerpt is from that report. **"**The Bear Mountain Fault Zone (central part of the Foothills fault system) is located approximately 3.5 miles to the southwest of the OHV area and includes the Melones Fault Zone, as well as numerous smaller, but related faults. According to the Fault Activity Map for California, these faults have not exhibited evidence of Quaternary displacement activity within the last 1.6 million years (Jennings, 1994)." Based upon the above, the report further states "the Seismic Shaking Map of California indicates there is a 10% probability of the OHV area exceeding peak ground acceleration 0.2g within the next 50 years (Paterson et. al., 1999)."

The Space Imaging Solutions report also indicates that "active landslide features located within the OHV area are primarily associated with horizontal trail cuts into the native slope material, primarily along the Riverbar Trail" (Space Imaging Solutions, 2005). The project site is well away from the steep slopes of the Riverbar Trail and would not be subject to landslides.

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The MX Track contains altered soils and fill that has been placed over riverwash (Space Imaging Solutions, 2005). This material was brought in to create the track in the late 1990s (Space Imaging Solutions, 2002a). During the storms of December 2005, some of the altered soils and fill was washed away by flood waters. Only the most compact of the fill remained after the flood waters receded. The repaired track would use only existing material to make the track safe for OHV again. Mitigation Measures BIO-1 to BIO-3 and BIO-6 will ensure that soil erosion would not occur during the repair work.

There are no geotechnical effects related to operation of the track once it has been repaired and reopened due to the absence of significant geologic features (landslides, fault zones) in or near the track footprint. However, soil erosion could occur from the ongoing use of the track once it has been repaired and reopened. Design of the repaired track includes a drainage swale that would hold soil erosion during rain events. Regular maintenance of the track conducted under a Stream Alteration Agreement with CDFG (refer to Appendix A) would minimize loose soils through watering and compaction and other erosion control measures. Finally, the ongoing use of the MX track requires compliance with the Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division's soil conservation program and soil loss guidelines.

c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

No Impact. The MX Track is located on relative level terrain with underlying riverwash substrate (Space Imaging Solutions, 2005). There are no unstable geologic units present.

d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

No Impact. The soil on which the track exists is riverwash and portions of the track are made from altered soils brought in to build the track. There are no expansive soils present that would create a substantial risk to life or property.

e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No Impact. The project does not propose the installation of new septic tanks.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	■	☐	☐
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	■
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	■
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	■
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	■
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized	☐	☐	☐	■

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The construction and operation of the project would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials such as asbestos, lead, toxic waste, etc. Gasoline and diesel are the only hazardous materials that would be involved in the repair work. There is potential for the heavy equipment used to carry out the track repair work to spill petroleum products during operation and refueling. In addition, refueling of motorcycles using the track could result in gasoline and oils spills at the site. In order to prevent contamination of on site soils the following mitigation measure would be implemented for the construction phase and use phase:

Mitigation Measure:

Measure HAZ-1: Refueling for vehicles used during the construction repair project shall follow the attached Best Management Practices (Vehicle and Equipment Fueling NS-9) including the following:

- Onsite vehicle and equipment fueling will only be used where it is impractical to send vehicles and equipment offsite for fueling.
- A dedicated fueling area will be established in the Mammoth Bar parking lot, protected from storm water run-on and runoff, and located at least 50 ft away from downstream drainage facilities and watercourses. Fueling will be performed on a level-grade area.
- Drip pans or absorbent pads will be used during vehicle and equipment fueling.
- Fueling operations will not be left unattended.

Effectiveness: Will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.
Implementation: CDPR, Gold Fields District.
Timing: Throughout the construction and use phase, when applicable.
Monitoring: CDPR, Gold Fields District.

b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

No Impact. A toxics inventory was conducted by Space Imaging Solutions and the results are reported in Space Imaging Solutions, 2005. The report concluded that "soil sampling … revealed little in the way of localized surface contamination of petroleum –based products (e.g., motor oil and fuel) within the areas most likely to contain isolated petroleum spills or discarded engine parts. These areas specifically included gravel parking lot and staging areas within the OHV circuit, and rider rendezvous points scattered at various locations." As a result no release of hazardous materials is expected to occur during the repair of the MX Track.

c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or hazardous waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No Impact. The proposed project does not involve the handling of hazardous materials and would not cause the emission of hazardous substances. None of the project components are within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No Impact. No hazardous materials or areas identified on the Cortese list are located within the Mammoth Bar OHV area. The area is not on the Department of Toxic Substance Control's (DTSC) Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (California DTSC, Website, July 2006).

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. Responses e – f. The project site is not within two miles of a public airport or a private airstrip. The nearest municipal airport (Auburn) is more than five miles from the project site. The site is located at the bottom of a steep river canyon and would not be subject to airplane safety hazards for workers.

g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. An emergency action plan was prepared for the Middle Fork American River project by the Placer County Water Agency after a gate malfunction occurred at the Ralston Afterbay Dam in August 2004 (PCWA, 2005). This project would not affect that adopted emergency action plan.

h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Less than Significant Impact. The project area is not located in an urbanized interface where residences are intermixed with wildlands. This is a State Recreation Area with allowable uses for outdoor recreation. In the event of a forest fire in the vicinity of the project, existing CDPR and Reclamation fire control and evacuation protocols would be implemented.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	■	☐	☐
b) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	■	☐	☐
c) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	■	☐	☐
d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☐	■
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	■	☐
f) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	■
g) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	■	☐
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	■	☐
i) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or	☐	☐	☐	■

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
mudflow?				

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

b. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

c. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation. Response a, c, & f. The project has the potential to degrade water quality due to the close proximity of the project site to the Middle Fork American River, and the grading needed to repair the track would create loose soil conditions. The impacts, however, can be mitigated through the use of specific measures already identified to reduce impacts on riparian habitat and on erodable soils (refer to BIO-1 to BIO-6 above). These measures restrict the timing of construction work during dry periods, require the use of sediment barriers, restrict vegetation removal to only that needed to carryout the repairs, and the restoration of areas left bare by the construction activity. In addition, CDPR has prepared a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for the project which will support a NPDES permit. No additional mitigation would be necessary.

As stated in the Geology and Soils section above, soil erosion could also occur from the ongoing use of the track once it has been repaired and reopened. Design of the repaired track includes a drainage swale that would hold soil erosion during rain events. Regular maintenance of the track conducted under a Stream Alteration Agreement with CDFG (refer to Appendix A) would minimize loose soils through watering and compaction and other erosion control measures. Finally, the ongoing use of the MX track requires compliance with the Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division's soil conservation program and soil loss guidelines.

d. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

No Impact. The proposed track repair work would not be paved and, therefore, would not increase the amount of impervious surfaces in the project area. The project does not include any other features that would affect groundwater supply.

e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less than Significant Impact. The site grading plan includes the construction of appropriately sized drainage features that are augmented by re-contouring that enhances dispersion of storm flows, resulting in a more natural flow pattern.

f. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

No Impact. This proposed project does not involve housing.

g. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

Less than Significant Impact. This proposed project does not involve construction or placement of any structures in the 100-year flood zone. While the proposed project would result in an earthen structure within the 100-year flood plane, the dimensions of the structure are such that they would not impede or redirect flood flows. In addition, the grading plan includes construction of appropriately sized drainage features that are augmented by re-contouring that enhances dispersion of storm flows, resulting in a more natural flow pattern.

h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

Less than Significant Impact. The project site is located on a river bar and is subject to flooding, and there is a dam upstream of the site that could cause substantial flooding in the area if the dam were to fail. Note that the upstream dam did fail in December 1964 resulting in a peak flow of 253,000 cubic feet per second (cfs) inundating large areas of Mammoth Bar. The dam is operated by the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA). Typical key peak flow events are more in the order of 50,000-70,000 cfs along the section of the Middle Fork American River that passes Mammoth Bar (Space Imaging Solutions, 2002a). The storm event that occurred in December 2005 and which damaged the MX Track was roughly 40,000 cfs (California Geologic Survey, 2006).

Although the site is subject to periodic flooding, the likelihood that people or structures would be harmed as a result of the project is extremely low. First, no structures are proposed and second, users of the recreation site can flee from rising flood waters either on their own or through evacuation orders issued by CDPR. In the unlikely event of a dam failure upstream, the PCWA in cooperation with CDPR would evacuate areas downstream though the use of emergency vehicles and/or aircraft (PCWA, 2005).

i. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No Impact. The project is not located in an area that is subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Conflict with any applicable land use				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	■

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. There is no established community within the project area. The area is used for day-use recreation only.

b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No Impact. No land use and planning impacts would occur from the proposed project. The project involves repairing an existing MX track that was damaged during storms of December 2005. The MX track has been operating under the terms of a settlement agreement between the Sierra Club, Friends of the River and the Oakland-based Environmental Law Foundation (plaintiffs) against CDPR over its operation of the Mammoth Bar OHV Area near Auburn.

Plaintiffs in the case asserted that off-highway vehicle operations at Mammoth Bar violated a wide array of state and federal environmental laws and that permits required by various state and federal regulatory agencies had never been obtained for the operation of the track at Mammoth Bar.

As a part of the agreement, an interim management plan period was initiated that allows the OHV track and trail facility to continue to operate Sundays, Mondays, and Thursdays, and for the period October 1 through March 31, also on Fridays. The interim plan would stay in effect until a long-term management study of ASRA is completed. CDPR is in the process of conducting the long-term comprehensive management study of both the Mammoth Bar OHV facility and the larger ASRA. A Task Force has been set up to help direct the study.

The settlement agreement specifically states no expansion of the OHV facility would proceed during the interim management period. The current project is not considered an expansion of the existing use, as it would reinstate a use that was included under the interim management plan. The track repairs would actually reduce the overall footprint of the MX track

and would move the track away from the river in certain areas (refer back to the project description).

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact. The project site is not located in a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan area.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	■

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact. Responses a - b. Construction of the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources of regional or local importance as project construction would not require the removal of material from the area. In addition, it would not result in the establishment of land uses that would preclude mineral extraction in the event that important mineral resources are considered for removal in the future.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	■	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	■
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	■

XI. NOISE

Would the project result in:

a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

No Impact. OHV activities already take place in the project area and OHV use is allowable in the Mammoth Bar OHV area on designated days.

b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

No Impact. No ground-borne vibration would occur as a result of the proposed project.

c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

No Impact. OHV activities already take place in the project area. Repairing the track would not increase actual noise to levels above those that existed before the track was storm damaged.

d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less than Significant Impact. The project may increase noise levels temporarily during project construction as a result of the need to conduct minor grading to repair the track. Since the area is already subject to OHV noise, the noise of the work equipment would not significantly change the noise environment in the area. If the repair were conducted during hours that the OHV area is closed, the ambient noise levels would be increased in areas near the track. However, the elevated noise levels would be short-term, lasting only 7 to 10 days, and recreational users can choose to limit their activities during construction.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. Responses e - f. The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport or airstrip.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	■

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. Responses a – c. No permanent population and/or housing would be generated as a result of the proposed project. The proposed project would not add any new permanent residents to the area. The proposed project would not displace existing housing in the area.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES --					
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
i)	Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	■
ii)	Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	■
iii)	Schools?	☐	☐	☐	■
iv)	Parks?	☐	☐	☐	■
v)	Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	■

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

i) Fire protection?

ii) Police protection?

iii) Schools?

iv) Parks?

v) Other public facilities?

No Impact. Responses ai – av. The project is contained entirely within the ASRA. No local governmental facilities related to fire protection, police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities would be impacted by the proposed project, nor would any new local governmental facilities need to be built as a result of the proposed project.

The repair of the MX track would just reinstate an existing use and would not add a new use that would require an increase in the existing services provided by CDPR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION --				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	■

XIV. RECREATION

a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

No Impact. Responses a and b. The repair of the MX track would reinstate an existing recreational use that is operating under the 1992 ASRA GP/IRMP. In the past, the MX track generated 15,000 user days per year at Mammoth Bar. Repairing and reopening the track would benefit the OHV community by providing a high quality motocross experience in an area that has high OHV demand.

The repaired track is not considered an expansion of the current use of the OHV area and is not expected to increase the pre-storm use of the OHV area. Long-term OHV use in ASRA will be assessed in the GP/IRMP currently under revision by CDPR and Reclamation.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	■
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	■	☐
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	■
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	■

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

No Impact. The repair of the track would not increase traffic in the area.

b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

No Impact. Since the project is contained within a State Recreation Area, no county congestion management plans apply to the project.

c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

No Impact. The proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

No Impact. The project would not change the design of, or in any way affect existing roads serving the project area.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less than Significant Impact. The project does not propose any changes or alterations to the existing highway and road networks. Emergency access to project facilities would be via the existing network of paved and unpaved roads and OHV trails.

f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?

No Impact. No existing parking areas would be affected.

g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

No Impact. The proposed project would not conflict with adopted alternative transportation policies.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	■
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	■
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	■
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	■

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No Impact. Responses a and b. There is no wastewater distribution system at the site. The site contains portable toilets for the park users. Impacts to water or wastewater treatment facilities would not occur.

c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No Impact. No new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities would occur as a result of the project.

d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

No Impact. No new water supplies or entitlements would be needed for the track repair project.

e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

No Impact. The project does not involve construction of any restrooms. All restrooms onsite are portable.

f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

No Impact. The amount of solid waste generated by at the site is not expected to change from what it was when the MX track was up and running.

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact. As the amount of solid waste generated after the track is repaired would be similar to pre-storm track conditions.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	■	☐	☐
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	■

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation. Mitigation measures as listed in this CEQA document would be applied to the project to avoid and minimize significant impacts to riparian habitat, erodable soils, and water quality. Thus, the project would have less-than-significant impacts to all environmental factors listed in this section.

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

No Impact. The project is restoring existing allowable use of the MX Track that was damaged by storms of December 2005. The assessment of the ongoing OHV use at Mammoth Bar is taking place via a comprehensive environmental planning and review process being conducted under the auspices of the 2000 Settlement Agreement between the Friends of the River, Sierra Club, and Environmental Law Foundation and CDPR. That environmental planning and review process is being carried out by the Goldfields District and is overseen by a task force made up of representatives of the environmental groups, OHV users, and others.

c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

No Impact. The proposed project would not have substantial adverse effects on human beings. The project area is within state recreation area lands that are surrounded by sparsely populated areas. Neighboring communities would not be substantially impacted by this project.

VI. References

A. BIBLIOGRAPHY

California Air Resources Board, December 2006. Website to determine the type and number of pollutant non-attainment days in 2006. www.arb.ca.gov. Link to Air Quality and Emissions.

California Department of Parks and Recreation, 2006. *Draft Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for the Mammoth Bar Motocross Track Repair project.*

California Department of Parks and Recreation, 2005. *Lower Castle Rock Trail, Chaparral Trail, and Indian Trail Closures Project, Initial Study and Negative Declaration*, January 2005.

California Department of Parks and Recreation, 2004. *Application for State Off-Highway Vehicle Grant or Cooperative Agreement, Mammoth Bar 2004-2005, Law Enforcement, Conservation, Restoration, Maintenance & Operations, prepared for the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.* 2004.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2003. *Agreement Regarding Proposed Stream Alternation re: maintenance of tracks and training area at Mammoth Bar Off-highway Vehicle Area.* Signed by Banky E. Curtis, June 17, 2003.

California Department of Fish and Game. 2006. *Agreement Regarding Proposed Stream Alternation re: repair of motocross track at Mammoth Bar Off-highway Vehicle Area.* Signed by Michael Lynch, CDPR , December 4, 2006.

California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2003. *2003 Report on the Status of the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle at the Mammoth Bar OHV Area*. Prepared by Vic Simpson, Resource Ecologist. December 1, 2003.

California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2003a. Map showing elderberry bush location in the Mammoth Bar OHVA. Prepared by Vic Simpson, Resource Ecologist. Dated 12/1/03.

California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2002. *2002 Report on the Status of the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle at the Mammoth Bar OHV Area*. Prepared by Vic Simpson, Resource Ecologist. Revised July 1, 2002.

California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2002a. Map showing elderberry bush location in the Mammoth Bar OHVA. Prepared by Vic Simpson, Resource Ecologist. Dated 8/1/02.

California Department of Parks and Recreation, 2002b. *Notice of Exemption for MX Track Maintenance and ATV Training Area Maintenance,* May 2002.

California Department of Parks and Recreation, 2002c. Historic Facility and Archaeological Site Project Evaluation (P.C.R.5024, 5024.5) Mammoth Bar *MX Track Maintenance and ATV Training Area Maintenance,* Prepared by Phil Hines. February 2002.

California Department of Parks and Recreation and Williams Wildland Consulting, Inc. 2002. *Mammoth Bar Off-Highway Vehicle Area: Wildlife Habitat Protection Plan.*

(California Department of Parks & Recreation) Prepared by Brian Williams. Revised June 2002.

California Department of Parks and Recreation, Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division, Soil Conservation Guidelines/Standards for Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Management, November 14, 1991.

California Department of Parks and Recreation, February 28, 1992. Wild and Scenic River Eligibility Assessment North and Middle Forks, American River.

California Department of Toxic Substance Control, 2006. *Cortese List on Website http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/,* July 24, 2006.

Code of Federal Regulations, 43 CFR, Subtitle B, Chapter 1, Part 420, Off-road vehicle use, October 1, 2006.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. July 6, 2006. Project Worksheet Report for Mammoth Bar Motorcycle Track, Final Review by Albert Hartung, 5/31/2006.

HDR, SWRI, Inc. 2006. Sacramento Suburban Water District Long-term Warrant Act Contract Environmental Assessment. Prepared for the Sacramento Suburban Water District, October 2006.

Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc. 2000. *Biological Resource Report for the Mammoth Bar Off-Highway Vehicle Area, CA.* October. (JSA99-128.) Placer County, CA U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Folsom, CA.

Placer County Water Agency – Emergency Action Plan, Middle Fork American River Project, December 31, 2004.

Space Imaging Solutions – 2005. *Mammoth Bar Project: Report of Findings, Geophysical and Soil Conditions*. California Department of Parks and Recreation. January 20, 2005.

Space Imaging Solutions – Environmental Science Associates. 2002. *Mammoth Bar Project: Hydrologic History Report*. California Department of Parks and Recreation. July 30, 2002.

Space Imaging Solutions – Environmental Science Associates. 2002a. *Mammoth Bar Project: Landscape History Report.* California Department of Parks and Recreation. October 2, 2002.

Space Imaging Solutions – Environmental Science Associates. 2002b. *Mammoth Bar Project: Soil Resources and Eros ional Features Inventory Assessment*. California Department of Parks and Recreation. October 18, 2002.

Superior Court of California for the County of Sacramento, Stipulation for Settlement and Dismissal, Friends of the River, Sierra Club, and Environmental Law Foundations versus the State of California Department of Parks and Recreation, re: Mammoth Bar OHV Area– 2000. July 2000.

U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region, February 11, 1993, American River Water

Resources Investigation Technical Team's Inventory and Recommendation for Wild and Scenic River Eligibility and Preliminary Classification.

U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region, August 10, 2006, Categorical Exclusion Checklist for the Dust Control System at Mammoth Bar OHV Park. CEC # 669.

U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region, 11/9/2006, email from Adam Nichols, USBR Archaeologist, to Matthew See, re: Dust Control System at Mammoth Bar OHV Park. Tracking Number: 06-NCAO-398.

U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. 1992. Auburn State Recreation Area Interim Resource Management Plan. September 1992.

Williams, Brian, 2002. Wildlife Habitat Protection Plan for the Mammoth Bar OHV Area. June 2002.

B. LIST OF AGENCIES CONTACTED

California Geologic Survey, Stephen Reynolds, Senior Engineering Geologist, May 2006

California Department of Fish and Game, Gary Hobgood, Biologist, July 2006

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Sacramento Valley Region, Robert Solecki, Environmental Scientist, 2006

Federal Emergency Management Agency, Joe Rodgers, Special Programs Manager, Sacramento Office of FEMA, 2006

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Tom Cavanaugh, August 2006

C. PRIMARY CONTACT LIST FOR MAMMOTH BAR TRACK REPAIR PROJECT

Ron Stork, Friends of the River
915 20th St.
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-442-3155 Ext. 220
rstork@friendsof the river.org

Jim Borow, Mammoth Bar Riders Assoc.
230 Oak Hill Way
Auburn, CA 95603
530-823-7637
cbgooser@gotnet.net

Terry Davis, Sierra Club
1414 K. Street, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-557-1100 Ext. 108
coordinator@sierraclub-sac.org

Dannas (Dani) Berchtold, OHV Representative
12636 Quail Hollow Drive
Auburn, CA 95603
530-888-0371
berchtd@rb5s.swrcb.ca.gov

Eric Peach, Protect American River Canyon
P.O. Box 9312
Auburn, CA 95604
530-885-8878
parc@jps.net

Dave Pickett, President
Amer. Motorcycle Assoc. (AMA) - Dist. 36
111 Andrea Dr
Vacaville, CA 95687
916-984-8253
president@ama-d36.org

D. LIST OF PREPARERS

Victoria Harris, Senior Associate, TRA Environmental Sciences

Michael Lynch, Project Manager, California Department of Parks and Recreation

Laura Caballero, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Natural Resources Specialist

Elizabeth Vasquez, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Natural Resources Specialist

VII. Correspondence

A. SIERRA CLUB LETTER DATED JANUARY 5, 2006

SIERRA CLUB
FOUNDED 1892

MOTHER LODE CHAPTER
1414 K STREET, SUITE 500
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
TEL. (916) 557-1100 x 108
FAX. (916) 557-9669
coordinator@sierraclub-sac.org
www.motherlode.sierraclub.org

January 5, 2006

Mike Lynch, Acting Superintendent
California State Parks
Auburn State Recreation Area
501 El Dorado St.
Auburn, CA 95603-4949

Re: **Recent Damage to the Mammoth Bar Off-Highway Vehicle Area in the Auburn State Recreation Area**

Dear Mike,

Thank you for your recent communication informing us that the motocross track and some OHV trails at the Mammoth Bar OHV Area were inundated and damaged by the recent storms and high American River flows. We are very concerned that State Parks may be rushing into reconstruction of the damaged portions without giving the matter greater consideration.

The settlement agreement that was reached in our litigation in 2000 was not an indication of our acceptance of motorized recreation at Mammoth Bar, nor did the agreement preclude any future action on our part. We remain concerned about the apparent incompatibility between providing for motorized off-road vehicle use and protecting the important natural resources and unique recreational opportunities of the American River Canyon.

Since the Gold Fields District is poised to update the General Plan for ASRA, it would be appropriate to suspend any plans to reconstruct the Mammoth Bar track pending the outcome of the General Plan update process. That process will determine whether motorized recreation is consistent with the management goals of the ASRA. If minimizing erosion, maintaining water quality, and providing a semi-primitive recreational experience are established as resource management goals, then motorized recreation appears to us to be inconsistent with those goals.

You will recall that our legal action five years ago was based on the fact that the Mammoth Bar facility was constructed without proper environmental review or the necessary state and federal permits. Should DPR and the Bureau proceed with plans to reconstruct the track and trails, we believe that an EIS/EIR is required, along with the permits etc. listed below:

- Fish and Game Code § 1601 (streambed alteration)
- Clean Water Act § 404 (fill)

- Clean Water Act § 402 (storm water)
- Clean Water Act § 401 (discharge)
- Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2) consultation
- Compliance with OHMVR track construction guidelines

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I would be pleased to meet with you and the new superintendent to discuss this issue.

Sincerely,

Terry Davis

Terry Davis
Conservation Program Coordinator
Mother Lode Chapter Sierra Club

cc:

Scott Nakaji, State Parks
Ronald Stork, Friends of the River
Tim Woodall, Protect American River Canyons
James Wheaton, Environmental Law Foundation

B. MAMMOTH BAR TASK FORCE MEETING AUGUST 9, 2006

M.G. "Mike" Lynch, Acting Superintendent

Auburn SRA – 501 El Dorado St. - Auburn, CA 956043-4949

530-823-4140 - Fax: 530-885-2798 - e-mail: *mlync@parks.ca.gov*

Meeting Agenda

8/9/06

Mammoth Bar Task Force

RE: Update on the Mammoth Bar Track Repair Project

Environmental:

- Initial Study (IS) will be a joint CEQA-NEPA (EA) document.

Track Work:

- We held a meeting on Thursday the 27th with Jack and Corky Azeveto at the Mammoth Bar Track and with myself, Steve Reynolds (Dept. of Conservation), and Terry Harper, Jeff Herman and Kenney Glaspie (all from the OHV Division). We walked the track and discussed many aspects of the repair, including the soil erosion features needed.
- In summary, the Azevetos' were very confident that there was enough material on site to repair the track to a very usable condition and size, within the smaller footprint. Even as important, they are very interested in doing the work and felt that with the assistance of state parks providing rental equipment and park staff, that it could be done within the constraints of the state's administration limits. They said that once every thing was ready to go, that the work could be done in a long week. They also felt quite confident that they could incorporate all of the soil erosion features proposed by Steve Reynolds into the repair work.
- Repair Time Frame. It was the consensus of everyone that the work would need to be done when there was enough soil moisture and no need to try to have extensive watering. Tentatively, contingent on all environmental requirements being met, late October after sufficient rains would be the ideal time for the track repair work to take place. The Azeveto's and Terry Harper felt that this time frame would work for them.
- Repair of Dust Suppression Watering System (DSWS). There was a consensus that the repair of the DSWS should go in after the track repair. This was for a number of reasons including that until we have the "as-built" repaired track, the final drawings for the contract cannot be made. Another factor was that the track will be repaired at the beginning of the wet season, when no watering will be necessary. This will give us hopefully 6 months or more to get a contract and get the new system in before we will need to begin serious watering.

Map of Project:

- Steve Reynolds has produced a draft map for review incorporating all of the aspects of the repair work, including the original footprint of the track and service roads associated with the track, the original track layout, the remaining portions of the track to be used as part of the repair, the proposed footprint for the repaired track/service roads and the areas with soil erosion features.

FEMA:

- I have been working with Matt Farris (Auburn SRA Maintenance Chief) and Joe Rogers regarding the FEMA requirements and funding.

Mike Lynch, Project Manager

MAMMOTH BAR TASK FORCE MEETING AUGUST 9, 2006

Meeting Notes by Mike Lynch

Mammoth Bar Task Force Members who Attended:

- Dannas (Dani) Berchtold, OHV Representative
- Jim Borrow, Mammoth Bar Riders Association
- Terry Davis, Sierra Club

State Park staff who attended:

- Mike Lynch, Acting Superintendent I, Auburn State Recreation Area
- Jay Galloway, State Park Superintendent II, Auburn State Recreation Area

Invited but Did Not Attend

- Ron Stork, Friends of the River

Notes:
Jay Galloway and I met on August 9th with the Mammoth Bar Task Force (except for Ron Stork from Friends of the River who could not attend). See below for a list of Task Force and park staff at the meeting. We provided the task force members with a written summary of the information on the track repair project as it now stands (copy attached) and discussed the items on the update. We also indicated the general timelines for the repair work would be late October. We presented and went over an updated draft project map (produced by Steve Reynolds of the Dept. of Conservation) showing the original track footprint and the new smaller footprint for the repaired track, the repaired service road and other features of the repair work. There were some questions and a discussion of the information. Terry Davis said he would brief Ron Stork on the meeting and get Ron his copy of the update. The meeting lasted from about 6pm to 8pm.

C. MAMMOTH BAR TRAILS UPDATE 1-24-07

Lynch, Mike

From: Lynch, Mike **Sent:** Thu 2/1/2007 2:00 PM
To: peach
Cc: 'president@ama-d36.org'
Subject: FW: Mammoth Bar Trails Update 1-24-07
Attachments: MB Trail culvert work.jpg(477KB) MB Trail work.jpg(663KB) MB Trail work #2 ranch corner.jpg(609KB) MB rolling dip water barrier.jpg(726KB)

From: Lynch, Mike
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2007 4:52 PM
To: Mammoth Bar Task Force 1
Cc: CABALLERO, Laura; Galloway, Jay; Harper Sr., Terry; Herman, Jeff; LeFlore, Rick; Nakaji, Scott; Reynolds, stephen; Victoria Harris
Subject: Mammoth Bar Trails Update 1-24-07

Hello Everyone,

I just wanted to give you an update report on Mammoth Bar, as follows:

Trails:

I am happy to report that the Mammoth Bar OHV trails are now in the best shape they have ever been in! At this time all the trails have been rated green+ by our Resource Ecologist using the OHV Soil Erosion Conservation Evaluation process. This is in contrast to this time last year when the trails had suffered a great deal of damage due to the big storms in December and January. We were able to accomplish this by the hiring of Jim Hatfield (as a retired annuitant equipment operator) and dedicating him to working on the trails. Jim has done an excellent job. Attached are some pictures of the work.

Water crossings:

Several years ago, we had identified nearly 20 intermittent stream trail crossings that needed to be brought up to OHV Soil Conservation Standards. Each year we have been able to complete some of this work. This last November we were able to complete the last of these projects and now all of the trails are up to this important standard. Attached is a picture of one of the crossings completed this year.

MX Track Repair:

We have been working diligently to complete the CEQA/NEPA documentation and related permits/agreements to repair the MX track. This has taken longer then expected, but I think we are going to have a very thorough and complete final product. We hope to have the final document available for public view within a month. Of course

everyone will be notified immediately as soon as it is available.

I think that covers it for now. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Yours truly,

Mike Lynch

M.G. "Mike" Lynch

Acting Supt. I - Mammoth Bar OHV Track Repair Project

Supervisor - Environmental Resources Group

Calif. State Parks - Auburn SRA - Gold Fields District

501 El Dorado Street, Auburn, CA 95603-4949

530-823-4140 Cell: 530-305-7794 Fax: 530-885-2708

D. RECLAMATION LETTER AUTHORIZING USE OF AMERICAN RIVER WATER

United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
Central California Area Office
7794 Folsom Dam Road
Folsom, California 95630-1799

APR 24 2001

IN REPLY REFER TO:
CC-418
WTR-1.10

Ms. Jacqueline Ball, District Superintendent
California Department of Parks and Recreation
7806 Folsom-Auburn Road
Folsom, California 95630-1797

Subject: Mammoth Bar

Dear Ms. Ball:

This letter confirms Reclamation's approval of supplying water to the California Department of Parks and Recreation for operations at Mammoth Bar under Cooperative Agreement Number 7FC20-8532A.

Reclamation has completed an environmental review for the use of up to approximately 49 acre-feet annually of water pumped from the American River at Mammoth Bar, generally between the months of April through October, and find it to be categorically excluded because the use of water is continuing with minor construction activities associated with an authorized project with no adverse environmental impacts.

Should you need more information or have questions, please contact Mr. Robert Schroeder at (916) 989-7274 (TDD 989-7285).

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Aiken
Area Manager

E. CALIFORNIA WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD, CENTRAL VALLEY REGION E-MAIL (401 CERTIFICATION QUESTION)

Lynch, Mike

From: Micheaels, Jim **Sent:** Wed 1/24/2007 10:10 AM
To: 'Robert Solecki'; Patrick Gilium
Cc: Lynch, Mike
Subject: RE: 401 Certification Question
Attachments:

Robert -

My understanding is that the DFG authority and streambed alteration agreements extend beyond the immediate stream zone and include riparian areas. This project will involve riparian areas, but not surface waters.
Jm.

-----Original Message-----
From: Robert Solecki [mailto:rsolecki@waterboards.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2007 8:38 AM
To: Micheaels, Jim; Patrick Gilium
Cc: Lynch, Mike
Subject: Re: 401 Certification Question

Jim
As I understand it, Auburn State Rec Area is not required to get a 404 permit but is required to get a DFG Streabed Alteration Agreement (SAA). Why is a DFG requiring a SAA for the project ? Are surface water bodies going to affected by the project ?
Bob

Robert Solecki
Environmental Scientist
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Central Valley Region
Stormwater and Water Quality Certification Unit
11020 Sun Center Drive # 200
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
Voice (916) 464-4684
Fax (916) 464-4681

>>> "Micheaels, Jim" <JMICHE@parks.ca.gov> 1/23/2007 4:03 PM >>>
Patrick or Robert -

We have a project at Auburn State Recreation Area to repair an established motocross track that was damaged last winter during the floods around the turn of the year. The project will actually result in a smaller footprint than the original track. We have prepared an EA/MND, which is just about complete. We worked with an engineering geologist from the CA Geologic Survey who helped determine that the project was outside of the Corps jurisdiction, so we are not getting a Corps 404 permit. We are getting a DFG Streambed Alteration Agreement. I also believe that we will be obtaining coverage under the NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities and filing an NOI. A SWPPP is being prepared.

I am used to getting a 401 certification because it is a condition of the Corps Nation-wide permits. In the instance above - do we need a 401 certification along with everything else we are doing? Thanks, JM.

Jim Micheaels, Staff Park & Recreation Specialist

Gold Fields District

7806 Folsom-Auburn Road

Folsom, CA 95630

(916) 988-0513

(916) 988-9062 fax